THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA Norfolk Division

JODIE LOVE)	
Plaintiff)	
v.)	CASE NO.: 2:16-CV-160
VIRGINIA PORT AUTHORITY)	
Defendant)	

PLAINTIFF'S REPLY BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE AMENDED COMPLAINT

Plaintiff Jodie Love, by counsel, submits this Reply Brief in support of her Motion for Leave to File an Amended Complaint pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 15.

It is unquestioned that a Motion to file an Amended Complaint typically contains the actual proposed Amended Complaint so that the Court may review it. In this case, however, there are some unique circumstances that caused a delay in the drafting of a legitimate Amended Complaint.

The Plaintiff was *pro se* when she initially drafted and filed her Complaint. The Defendant filed a Motion to Dismiss based upon numerous assertions. The Court deferred its ruling on the Motion to Dismiss until the parties more fully documented their respective arguments as it pertained to a defense of sovereign immunity. Plaintiff retained counsel at that point. When counsel reviewed the remainder of Defendant's Motion to Dismiss and the content of the Complaint, it became apparent that there was a legitimate chance that the Motion could be granted due to potentially deficient pleading on the part of the Plaintiff even if the Court sided with Plaintiff regarding the sovereign immunity argument.

Furthermore, in reviewing the Complaint, counsel noted that there were various actions alleged which could not be supported by the facts which were pled. Counsel required a short period of time to thoroughly review the pleadings, case history, determine whether other parties should be joined, which causes of action should be added or removed, engage in document review and conduct case law research.

Plaintiff was concerned that the Court might rule in her favor as it pertains to the sovereign immunity issue, but then dismiss the case based upon a deficient pleading. Plaintiff was simply seeking an opportunity to plead her claims correctly, and a proposed Amended Complaint is attached hereto as Exhibit 1. Again, it is understood that the standard procedure would be to submit a proposed Amended Complaint at the time of the initial Motion. However, Plaintiff begs the Court's indulgence given the circumstances. It would be unfair to Plaintiff to not allow her the time necessary to prepare a valid and appropriate Amended Complaint when said pleading was necessary to correct mistakes made while *pro se*.

Defendant in its Brief in Opposition revisits its sovereign immunity argument. Plaintiff simply reasserts her earlier position that the Court does not have enough information at this time to rule that Defendant benefits from that protection.

_______/s/_ Gregory William Klein, Esquire

Respectfully Submitted,

Gregory William Klein, Esquire Virginia State Bar No.: 73110 Taylor & Walker, P.C. 555 Main Street, Suite 1300 Norfolk, VA 23510

Voice: (757) 625-7300 Fax: (757) 625-1504

gklein@taylorwalkerlaw.com Counsel for Plaintiff Jodie Love

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on the 6th day of January, 2017, I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of Court using the CM/ECF system, which will then send electronic notification of such filing (NEF) to the following counsel of record:

Jimmy Frank Robinson, Jr., Esquire Ogletree Deakins Nash Smoak & Stewart PC 901 East Byrd Street, Suite 1300 Richmond, VA 23219

Phone: 804-843-1808 Fax: 804-843-1809

Jimmy.robinson@ogletreedeakins.com

James Clay Rollins, Esquire Ogletree Deakins Nash Smoak & Stewart PC 901 East Byrd Street, Suite 1300 Richmond, VA 23219

Phone: 804-441-6149 Fax: 804-843-1809

Clay.rollins@ogletreedeakins.com

/s/

Gregory William Klein, Esquire Virginia State Bar No.: 73110 TAYLOR & WALKER, P.C. 555 Main Street, Suite 1300 Norfolk, VA 23510

Voice: (757) 625-7300 Fax: (757) 625-1504

gklein@taylorwalkerlaw.com